

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

the Court House without the slightest demonstration on the part of the people. Brown looked somewhat better; his eye is not so much swollen; Stevens had to be supported and reclined on a mattress on the floor of the Court room, evidently unable to sit. He has the appearance, almost of a dying man, breathing with difficulty, and panting for breath.

Before the reading of the arraignment, Mr. Hunter called the attention of the Court to the necessity of appointing additional counsel for the prisoners, stating that one of the counsel, Mr. Faulkner, appointed by the County Court, considering his duty in that capacity as having ended, had left here. The Court requested Mr. Green to act as counsel for the prisoners, and he consented to do so.

Capt. Brown arose and said: I do not intend to detain the Court, but merely wish to say, as I have been promised a fair trial, that I am not now in circumstances that enable me to attend a trial, owing to the state of my health. I have a severe injury in the back, or rather in one kidney, which enables me very much, but I am doing very well, and I only ask for a short delay of my trial, and I think I may yet be able to listen to it, and I merely ask this, that, as the saying is, "the devil may have his due"—no more. I wish to say farther that my hearing is impaired and rendered indistinct in consequence of the wounds I have about my head; I cannot hear distinct at all; I could not hear what the Court has said this morning; I would be glad to hear what is said on my trial, and I am now doing better than I could expect. So that, seeing under the circumstances, a very short time to ask more than a very short delay, so that I may, in some degree, recover, and be able, at last, to listen to my trial and hear what questions are asked of the citizens, and what their answers are. If that could be allowed me I should be very much obliged.

The Court ordered the indictment to be read, so that the prisoners could plead guilty or not guilty, and would then consider Capt. Brown's request. The prisoners all responded "not guilty" to the usual question, and desired to be tried separately.

Mr. Hunter—The State elects to try John Brown.

The Court—His condition must be inquired into.

Mr. Botts—I am instructed by Brown to say that he is mentally and physically unable to proceed with his trial at this time. He has also heard to-day that counsel of his own choice will be here, whom he will of course prefer. He asks only for a delay of two or three days. It seems to me but a reasonable request, and I hope the court will grant it.

Mr. Hunter, for the Commonwealth, was of opinion that it was not proper to delay the trial of the prisoner for a single day. He alluded to the condition of things by which they were now surrounded, and the pressure upon the physical resources of the community. He spoke at great length in opposition to the request, as also did Mr. Harding.

Mr. Green thought a delay desirable.

The Court stated that if physical inability were shown, a reasonable delay must be granted. The brief period remaining before the close of the term of the court rendered it necessary to proceed as expeditiously as practicable. He would request the physician who attended Brown to testify as to his condition.

Oct. 28.—The afternoon session of yesterday was occupied with the examination of Col. Washington and conductor Phelps; nothing of importance was elicited beyond what has already been disclosed in their published statements. Cook was brought here at one o'clock this morning. He says that if Brown had taken his advice in relation to mounting the men, a force one thousand strong could not have beaten them. He says that Fred Douglass noted the coward, as he promised to be there in person. There is great rejoicing here on the arrest of Cook. George H. Hoyt, Esq., of Boston, arrived here this morning to act as counsel for Brown. He is quite a young man.

The Court met at 11 o'clock. Brown was led over from the jail, walking very feebly, and laid down on the cot.

The jury was then called, and Mr. Botts announced the arrival of Mr. Hoyt, who had come to assist the counsel for Brown. At present, however, he did not feel disposed to take a part in the case. Whenever he should feel disposed, he should do so.

[Several witnesses were examined for the prosecution, but as their evidence was only a repetition of the facts with which our readers are already acquainted, it is hardly necessary to repeat it here. The prosecution having finished the examination of its witnesses, some witnesses were examined for the defense, but from the following statement it may be inferred that some who were most desired, were not there.]

During the afternoon's proceedings, in the trial of Brown, several witnesses were called for the defense, and not answering, Mr. Brown here arose from his mattress, and evidently excited, standing on his feet, addressed the Court as follows:

"May it please the Court, I discover that notwithstanding all the assertions that I have received of a fair trial, nothing like a fair trial is to be given me, as it would seem. I gave the names as I could get them, of the persons I wished to have called as witnesses, and was assured that they should be subpoenaed. I wrote down a memorandum to that effect, saying where those parties were; but it appears that they have not been subpoenaed, so far as I can learn, and now I ask, if I am to have anything like a fair trial, that this proceeding be deferred until to-morrow morning; for I have before stated that I have not, at present, counsel on whom I feel that I can rely; but I am in hopes that counsel may arrive who will attend to seeing that I get the witnesses who are necessary for my defense. I am myself unable to attend to it. I have given all the attention I possibly could to it, but am unable to see or know about the witnesses, and cannot even find out their names, and I have nobody to do any errands for me, for my money was all taken from me when I was shot and stabbed, and I have not a dime. I had two hundred and fifty or sixty dollars, in gold and silver, taken from my pocket, and I have no possible means of getting anybody to do my errands for me, and they have not been done, nor have all the witnesses been subpoenaed; they are not within reach, and are not here. I ask at least until to-morrow morning, to have something done, if anything is designed—let me be ready for anything that may come up."

Brown then lay down again, drew his blanket over him, and appeared to sink into tranquil slumber.

Mr. Hoyt, Brown's counsel from Boston, asked for an adjournment till morning, on the ground that Judge Tilden would probably arrive during the night, and be able to appear as counsel. He excused himself from conducting the defense, because not acquainted with Virginia criminal practice.

After further conversation between the counsel, Mr. Green then arose to state that Mr. Botts and himself would now both withdraw from the case, and could no longer act in behalf of the prisoner, he having got up and declared that he had no confidence in the counsel who have been assigned to him. Feeling conscious, after this statement, that I should be an intruder upon this case were I to act for him from this time forward, I had not the disposition to undertake the defense but accepted the duty imposed on me, and I do not think, under these circumstances, when I feel compelled to withdraw from the case, that the Court should insist that I should remain in such an unenviable position.

The Court would not compel the gentlemen to remain on the case, and accordingly granted their request. The proceedings at this point were postponed and the Court adjourned at 6 o'clock.

Great excitement prevails in the town, and the guard has been increased, the conduct of Brown being regarded as a trick.

Oct. 29.—The Court met at 10 o'clock this morning. The Judge announced that he had received a note from the new counsel of the prisoner, requesting a delay of a few minutes, to enable him to have a brief interview with the prisoner. He would accordingly wait a short time. Soon after, Brown was brought in and took his usual recumbent position in bed. Samuel Chilton, of Washington City, appeared as the additional counsel for the prisoner, and was qualified. Henry Griswold, of Cleveland, Ohio, was also qualified as counsel for the prisoner.

Mr. Chilton made an explanatory statement. He was unexpectedly called upon yesterday to aid in this defense. He came with the expectation of merely assisting the gentlemen who were conducting the defense, but on reaching here he found that they had withdrawn from the case. He then determined to do his best, not feeling at liberty to refuse under the circumstances. However, it would be impossible for him to discharge the full duty of counsel, not having had time to read the indictment or examine the evidence already given. He made no motion, but he would advise the Court of a few hours, that he and his brother counsel could make some preparation.

The Court decided that the trial must go on. No more delays could be granted.

The trial then proceeded.

Mr. Hoyt, for the prisoner, objected to receiving as evidence the letter of Gerrit Smith, heretofore published. Also, the autobiography of Brown, written by himself.

Several witnesses were then examined by Mr. Hoyt, and cross-questioned by the prisoner while lying in his bed, wrapped up in a blanket. The testimony was mainly relative to Brown's treatment of his prisoners.

The Court decided that the trial must go on. No more delays could be granted.

At one o'clock a recess was taken for dinner.

Afternoon session.—Several witnesses for the prisoner were examined, all proving that Brown had treated his prisoners with humanity, and freely expressed his regret that bloodshed should have been caused by him in self defense.

The defense closed their testimony at about four o'clock, and the State desired to give the case to the jury without argument. Capt. Brown insisted that his counsel should argue the case. After the opening speech for the State, the Court adjourned till Monday morning, when the counsel for the prisoner will proceed.

October 31.—The Court met at nine o'clock this morning. The prisoner was brought in, and the trial proceeded without delay. Brown looks better than heretofore, and his health is eventually improving. He laid on the bed as usual. The Court House and its approaches were densely crowded.

Mr. Griswold opened for the defense, taking up the several charges of the indictment, and replying to the points made in the opening argument of the prosecution. He alluded to the peculiar circumstances surrounding the present case, and hoped the jury would give it calm and dispassionate attention, diverting as far as possible, their minds from all prejudices, and discarding outside influences. Let the prisoner have an impartial trial, under the laws of Virginia, and let him be acquitted or convicted according to the evidence given in the case.

With regard to the charge of treason brought against the prisoner; Mr. Griswold argued that Brown could not be guilty of treason, as he was not a citizen of the Commonwealth, and none but a citizen of the Commonwealth can commit treason. Never having sworn allegiance to Virginia, he could not be a rebel against her authority. He was also charged with levying war against the State, but the evidence given did not support the charge. There was a great difference between levying war and resisting authority by men who are congregated together, to perpetrate crime, and have their roles and regulations. When they are assailed they defend their lives to the utmost, sacrificing their own, and intending to sacrifice the lives of others; but that is resisting, not levying war. He would not shrink from the admission, and the prisoner had openly admitted it, that these men came with the purpose of running away from slaves. That was a crime under the law of Virginia, for which the prisoner was amenable to the punishment to the extent of those laws. In carrying out that purpose, he temporarily took possession of the arsenal at Harper's Ferry. While there, attempts were made to arrest him; Mr. Griswold had no complaint to make about that, but it was resisting those attempts that blood was shed, and the lives taken, and not in levying war against the Commonwealth of Virginia. It was in resisting that which was claimed to be the legal authority of Virginia seeking to arrest these men assembled in violation of law. He further argued that the jury could not find Brown guilty of associating with others to organize a government, to subvert and overturn the government of Virginia, but if the pamphlet proves anything, it shows an attempt was made to organize a government in opposition to the government of the United States, and not Virginia. He proceeded to consider the charge of conspiring with slaves. He said there was a manifest distinction between the effort to run off slaves or steal slaves, and conspiracy to induce them to rebel. Rebellion and insurrection was rising up, not to run away, although freedom might be the ultimate object, but rising against the mastery; against the whites; against the State, and more especially servile insurrection.

He here proceeded to consider the count charging murder in the first degree. This was a crime

involving premeditated murder, but he argued that no such malice had been shown. Haywood was killed, how it happened, nobody knows. It was done in the dark, whether by accident or intention does not appear in the evidence, or by whom; perhaps these men are guilty of that killing in some form, but it is not proven to be murder in the first degree; the result of deliberate, premeditated malice.

Brown knew that he was committing an offense on slave property; he has repeatedly confessed it, and is willing to abide the consequences; indict him for that offense, and don't convict him of an offense he never dreamed of committing. Public safety does not require him to be punished contrary to the law. Mr. G. closed with an earnest appeal to the jury.

Mr. Chilton, for defense, followed. He claimed that treason means betrayal of trust or confidence, the violation of fidelity or allegiance to the Commonwealth. He maintained that treason could not be committed against the Commonwealth except by the citizens thereof. There was a general principle, that the accused should have the benefit of every doubt. In considering evidence, we must consider the whole of it. The 46th Article of this Provisional Constitution, expressly declares the foregoing articles shall not be construed to encourage the overthrow of any State government or general government, and looks to no dissolution of the Union, but simply amendment, and repeal of several laws.

Again, the prisoner is charged with conspiring with slaves, to make an insurrection. No proof had been shown that the slaves entered with the conspiracy, and unless that was the case, there was no conspiracy; one party cannot conspire alone.

Each charge is to be considered alone by the jury. If they believe that the evidence does not warrant a conviction of treason, they must consider the charge of conspiracy just as if no charge of treason had been made. One count in the indictment was not to be brought into the aid of another. He considered the prisoner had a right to be tried on one charge at a time, and entirely disconnected with any other.

Mr. Hunter closed the argument for the prosecution.

The argument of counsel in the case of Brown being concluded, Mr. Chilton asked the court to instruct the jury that if they believed the prisoner was not a resident of Virginia, they cannot convict him on the count of treason. The court declined, saying that the constitution did not give rights and immunities alone, but also responsibilities.

Mr. C. asked another instruction, to the effect that the jury must be satisfied as to the place where the offense was committed—whether within the boundaries of Jefferson county. The court granted it.

A recess for half an hour was taken, when the jury came in with their verdict. An intense excitement prevailed in the court room. Brown sat up in his bed while the verdict was rendered. The jury found him "guilty of treason, in advising and conspiring with slaves and others to rebel; and of murder in the first degree." Brown lay down quietly. He said nothing, and there was no demonstration of any kind.

Mr. Chilton moved an arrest of judgment, both on account of the error in the indictment, and in the verdict. The objection in regard to the indictment has been already stated; the prisoner had been tried for an offense not appearing on the record of the grand jury. The verdict was not on each count separately, but a general verdict on the whole indictment. The prisoner has also been found guilty on both counts for the murder of the same persons. It was manifest that he could not be guilty of both. By agreement, the points will be argued to-morrow morning.

Mr. Harding announced that he was ready to try Coppel, who was brought in, the ceremony of passing between a file of armed men being dispensed with. Coppel took a seat between Griswold and Hoyt, who appeared as his counsel. He seemed calm and composed. The remainder of the day was spent in endeavoring to obtain a jury. The panel was not complete when, at 5 o'clock, the Court adjourned.

Nov. 1.—The Court met at ten o'clock. Coppel was brought in. Previous to proceeding with his trial, Mr. Griswold stated the points on which an arrest of judgment was asked for in Brown's case, and in addition to the reasons mentioned yesterday, said it had not been proved beyond a doubt that he was even a citizen of the U. S. He argued that treason could not be committed against a State, but only against the General Government, citing the authority of Judge Story; also that the jury had not found the prisoner guilty of the crimes as charged in the indictment; had not responded to the offenses charged, but found him guilty of offenses not charged; they found him guilty of murder in the first degree, when the indictment does not charge him with offenses constituting that crime.

Mr. Hunter replied, quoting the Virginia code to the effect that technicalities should not arrest the administration of justice. As to jurisdiction over treason, it is sufficient to say that Virginia had passed a law assuming that jurisdiction and defining what constitutes that crime.

The Court reserved its decision.

Brown was present during the argument.

Nov. 2.—Brown was brought into the Court House which was immediately thronged. The court gave its decision on the motion to arrest the judgment, overruling the objections made. On the objection that treason cannot be committed against the State except by a citizen, it ruled that wherever allegiance was due, treason could be committed. Most of the States have passed laws against treason. The objections as to the form of the verdict rendered were also considered as insufficient. The clerk then asked Brown whether he had anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced. Brown stood up, and in a clear voice said: "I have, may it please the court, a few words to say. In the first place, I deny everything but what I have all along admitted; the design on my part was to free the slaves. I intended certainly to have made a clean thing of that matter, as I did last winter when I went to Missouri, and I then took the slaves without the snapping of a gun on either side. I moved them through the country and finally left them in Canada. I designed to have done the same thing again, on a larger scale."

That was all I intended; I never did intend to commit murder or treason, or to destroy property, or to excite or to incite the slaves to rebellion and to make an insurrection. I have another objection, and that is, it is unjust I should suffer such a penalty; had I interfered in the manner, and which has been fairly proved, for I admire the truthfulness and candor of the greater portion of the witnesses who have testified in this case, had I so interfered in behalf of the rich, the powerful,

the intelligent, the so-called great, or in behalf of their friends—either father, mother, brother, sister, wife or children, or any of that class, and sacrificed what I have in this interference, it would have been all right. Every man in this court would have deemed it an act worthy of reward rather than punishment. This court acknowledges, as I suppose, the validity of the law of God."

While Brown was speaking, perfect quiet prevailed. When he finished, the court proceeded to pronounce the sentence, after a few preliminary remarks. He said no reasonable doubt could exist as to the prisoner's guilt. He sentenced him to be hung in public, on Friday, the 2d of December.

Brown received the sentence with composure. The only demonstration made was with the clapping of hands by one man in the crowd, who is not a resident of Jefferson county. This was promptly suppressed, and much regret was expressed by citizens at its occurrence.

The verdict is Coppel's case is guilty on all the counts of the indictment. After being out an hour the jury in the case of Coppel returned with a verdict declaring him guilty on all the counts in the indictment. His counsel then gave a notice of motion to arrest of judgment, as in Brown's case. The Court then adjourned.

Communications.

LETTER FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

EDEN, October 13, 1859.

FRIEND JONES: Seeing the younger Gilberts have been trying their skill at "Bugle" blowing, I have decided to make an effort also. I make no pretensions to musical talent, and am ignorant of the gamut, but I suspect, from the sounds, that they blow from opposite ends of the horn. Permit me to try it midway between the ends.

At 70 I continue to sympathize with the cause which has brought them into the literary arena, but alas! I am impotent. I can't vote (having given my last in 1809). I have not funds, like C. F. Hoovey; I can't lecture in these days of eloquence, and the U. G. R. R. does not pass by any of my places of sojourn. This is a privation, for I do not forget that long ago the colored population of York, Pa., and myself, owned all the stock of the track that passed through that place, and performed all the duties of firemen, engineers, brakemen, conductors and baggage masters. The duties of the last were not onerous. Firemen had an easy time of it except when a temperature up to fever heat was required; brakemen had little to do but check empty trains that came in quest of freight. Engineering and conducting brought into requisition the skill and bravery of our best men, but they proved equal to the work for they never ran off the track, nor suffered the freight to be damaged.

The by-gone will do well enough to remember, but it will not do to live upon; so having no power for better work, it seems like doing something terrible.

So much about the first person, singular, can serve no conceivable purpose unless to console some other superannuate that he is not alone in having outlived his usefulness.

It might be supposed that living long in a world governed by uniform laws, we should, through familiarity become reconciled to our surroundings. It is not always so. As far back as memory reaches, the barbaric eat as his cups; Labor was subordinate to Capital; Products estimated above the Producer; the Slave was doomed to endless servitude;—Life was not inviolable, for the Soldier poured out his life blood on the battle field, and the Criminal was strangled on the gallows. Woman had a partial social existence, and a still more limited legal one. All these, and more, have been while I have been, and that it is so, instead of inuring one to them, increases astonishment and excites indignation, that two average ages have so slightly modified them.

How is this to be accounted for, seeing we have a large class of learned, ordained men set apart to discover, and point out the way we should go; holding in their hands a divinely inspired volume, which with their explanation makes the path so plain that the way far need be at no loss? Is it that their authority is not reliable? Is it attributable to their incompetency, or unwillingness to expound it aright? Or do they harmonize with "The children of this world who are wiser than the children of light"? The unlearned in divinity must believe that when these expounders read the Jewish decalogue, they do it with their backs to the South, while their eyes rest on "Thou shalt not kill, steal, or commit adultery;" or that they are not bound to "declare the whole counsel of God," in a supererogatory dispensation. But waiving their obligation to press antiquated injunctions, they have a new law for which they claim infallibility. In that law are a few mysticisms which require to be spiritualized to make them comprehensible to ordinary intellects; such as "I am the door, the way," &c.; "except ye eat my flesh," &c.; "you in me and I in you," &c., cannot be taken literally. Not so, however, with "Forgive your enemies; as ye would that others do unto you," &c.; "break every yoke," &c. There is no figure in these; they are literal, common sense precepts, of daily, life long obligations, and cannot be substituted with conventionalisms.

The expounders find no woe! pronounced on the non-performance of the works so comprehensively implied in these injunctions: on the contrary every palliation which clerical tact can devise, is resorted to for justification;—not only so, but the gospel (?) artillery is aimed with learned skill at those who strive to render simple justice popular, and to expand fraternal beyond the limits of caste, or other conventionalisms.

These teachers of the people plead that matter of infinite importance demands their almost unremitting thought, and undivided labor; namely, the spread of faith, on which alone, the possibility of never ending happiness is predicated, and on the absence of which an eternity of misery is inevitable.

I marvel, nor can I cease to marvel, that developed intellects, if they are honest, can attach more importance to questions of mere belief, regarding that of which nothing can be known but by special direct revelation, than to our relations in this sphere of existence, where our duties do not originate in speculative theories but in felt necessities. The marvel is still greater that in a world of growing intelligence so late as the afternoon of the nineteenth century, the people should have sufficient taste for such teaching to induce them to patronize such teachers. Why the very school children without a sacred book or expounder of it, have intuitive perceptions, instructing them better. Would they not say in their childish phraseology, "How ugly it is to get drunk. Ain't women as good as men? It can't make a man better to hang him. Are the soldiers all mad at each other? Would they

leave their wives and children and go into a far country to kill men they never saw nor heard of, if somebody did not set them on? What right has one man to say to another you shall work for me as long as you live; I will give you what I please, to eat, and sell away your wife and children when I choose?

Some will say, "This is nothing but childish instinct." Admitted; but is it not preferable to the civilized, Christianized, Republican philosophy the legitimate results of which are transpiring around us, bringing sorrow to the philanthropic soul? What has been gained by a growth from such juvenility, to such manhood as we boast of? Do churchmen and statesmen claim the praise? Let them have it.

That the friends of equal, universal liberty may be faithful and firm, is the abiding wish of

AMOS GILBERT.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, NOVEMBER 5, 1859.

THE BUGLE can be obtained every Friday, of Isaac Trecoott, at Steer's Book Store on Main street, Salem, Ohio.

FRANCES ELLEN WATKINS is authorized to obtain subscribers for the Bugle, and to receive for any numbers paid on account of the paper.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE TO BUGLE, \$1.50 PER ANNUM, INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Will meet at the house of B. S. Jones on the 6th inst, at the usual hour.

THE OLD HERO.

When the Wellington Rescuers were lying in Cuyahoga County Jail, and the meeting of ten thousand was held so near that the vote upon each resolution was heard in its cells, we hoped there was enough of the old revolutionary spirit remaining in the hearts of the people to open the prison doors, and bid the captives go free. But that occasion, which might have been made the turning point in freedom's battle, was permitted to pass unimproved. The event sank in point of dignity and interest to the zero of a mere party squabble, out of which both Democrats and Republicans tried to make political capital.

And so with Captain Brown's attempt to reduce to practice the almost forgotten, and totally disregarded doctrines of the Declaration of American Independence. The principle upon which the attempt was based, the glorious object of the slave's deliverance which he had in view, and the heroism of this martyr to freedom, have altogether been lost sight of, by that party which some anti-slavery tendencies. In treating of the event, its principal desire seems to be, to disprove the ridiculous charge of the Democrats, that the Republican party is responsible for the attempt, and that it endorses the course of Captain Brown. The Republican party has not heart enough, or principle enough to justify the insurrection upon the ground of right, even though condemning it as impolitic. Every one who believes in the doctrine of self-defense as taught by political parties and churches, and who believes in the doctrine of human equality as set forth in the Declaration of '76, should feel bound to justify the act of Captain Brown, and exclaim "Well done, old hero!"

In 1850 the property of Captain Brown in Kansas was destroyed, and some of his family murdered in cold blood; and this by consent of the U. S. Government, which had pledged itself to protect him and his there. The old man had been a close student of the Declaration of Independence. He honored the heroes of that day; and he honored all heroes—Nathaniel Turner included—who had since fought in defense of its doctrines. He required from that his ideas of a just government, and although he found that the U. S. government fell far short of the standard therein set up, he and his friends waited awhile until satisfied that "a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinced a design to reduce them, under absolute despotism," then, with the Declaration as their guiding star, they struck the blow at Harper's Ferry. And whatever party politicians may say, whatever quibblers may pretend, that document vindicates their actions, for it not only asserts "their right to throw off such government," but enjoins it as a positive duty.

And where stand the men to-day who claim to believe in human equality, and in the right of self defense? Where stand the men who have been telling John Brown on every 4th of July that he ought to do that which he attempted to do at Harper's Ferry? They have slunk away out of sight, not daring to vindicate the right of the old hero to strike such a blow, not daring to do more that suggest insanity as a palliation of the deed. It was well that they did not live in the days of the revolution; else they would have pronounced Warren a monomaniac, and Washington a madman.

The old man was doubtless mistaken in "The Hour"—he commenced the work before the preparations were completed, and he is like to pay the penalty for his mistake, and be torn to pieces by the officials of Virginia and of the United States. With our views of the character of the Federal government, and of the responsibility for its actions which attaches to each member of the organization, the condition of Captain Brown, wounded and a prisoner, with few friends to sympathize with him, and surrounded by hordes of blood thirsty enemies, is infinitely preferable to that occupied by any member of the government which is clamoring for his death by the gallows. If he is doomed thus to suffer, we fear there is no manhood enough in the nation to attempt a reversal of the decision of official tyranny; or if there is, perhaps the attempt would be impotent to save. If the slave power shall doom him to execution upon the gallows, and if the government sustained by Republicans and Democrats shall see that the sentence is fulfilled, we trust that his death will awaken a spirit that will defy all laws and all constitutions that forbid the plucking of the captive from the hands of his master.

War is always terrible, and a servile war more to be deprecated than a war between nations. But no other war is so terrible as the war which slavery wages. Give us any other war in preference to that. All the real or fancied horrors of a servile insurrection, burning cities, desolated villages, and murdered people, will not begin to compare with the amount of suffering inflicted upon humanity by the continuance of slavery. What is a burning city, compared to the destruction of

those hopes and aspirations, those longings of the soul which the fires of slavery have scorched and blackened? What is a desolated village, compared with the utter desolation which reigns supreme where slavery abides? What is the mere killing of the body, compared with the sad record marked by the living grave stones reared over the millions of buried minds which slavery has murdered?

BRODERICK AND BROWN.

Broderick, an anti-Lecompton Democrat, fell in a duel with Judge Terry, having been challenged because of personal reflections which he made upon his opponent during a political canvass. His dying declaration, "They have killed me because I was opposed to the extension of slavery, and a corrupt administration," has been put forward by the Republican press as conclusive evidence of his being a martyr in the cause of freedom, and as a sufficient reason to canonize his memory, and mould his reputation to the form of a political saint.

Admitting, for the time, that Broderick was killed because he was opposed to the extension of slavery and a corrupt administration, and that his memory should therefore be held in grateful remembrance, and his death duly avenged; what shall be said of Captain John Brown, who was killed—or will be—because he was opposed, not merely to the extension, but the existence of slavery, not merely to a corrupt administration, but to a corrupt and pro-slavery government? Shall his memory be embalmed? Or is it asking too much of those editors who exalt Broderick, to exalt yet higher Ossawatimie Brown? If Broderick was a martyr because he was killed for opposing the extension of slavery, then is Brown unquestionably a more worthy martyr because he was killed for opposing its existence. And though it may be urged that Brown fell as an insurgent, yet Broderick fell as a duelist—both violating the laws of their country, but in the case of Captain Brown the violation was entirely disinterested, and far more honorable than that of Broderick. And yet Republicans talk of building a monument to Broderick, and are assisting the Democrats to erect a gallows for Brown!

GLORIOUS NEWS FROM KENTUCKY.

The Chivalry Triumphant! A storm was brewing! Incipient insurrection tipped in the bud! One man, one married woman, and four girls utterly defeated! No reports yet received of the killed and wounded!

By an article in another column, it will be seen that the office and press of the *Free South*, at Newport, Ky., has been assailed by the defenders of slavery, and the salvators of the Union. We copied in last week's Bugle an admirable article from that paper, entitled—"How to oppose slavery with effect;" and it is no marvel that a paper which published such articles became obnoxious to Kentucky chivalry. Had Mr. Baily contented himself with preaching such doctrines as do the Republican brethren in Ohio, he would doubtless have preserved his property, though possibly not his principles. Why could he not content himself with talking against the extension of slavery? Had he done so, he might even have uttered many harsh words against the system itself, which is allowable for those to do who have no intention of interfering with slavery where it is protected by state laws.

It was certainly fatal, if not insane, to attack slavery where it did exist; and the very height of insanity to insist upon a warfare against the chattel principle, instead of advising the judicious pruning of the branches of the tree, giving comeliness to its appearance, and vigor to its growth.

EQUALITY. The slaveholder insists that he has a right to hold his slaves, in transitu, in this State. To concede this right would be to concede more to the slaveholder than the law concedes to our own citizens—who are denied the right to hold slaves at all.—*Albany Journal.*

Not so. There are many New Yorkers who hold slaves in the South. If the right to hold slaves in that State in transitu is conceded, it would be conceded to the New York slaveholder as much as to the Virginia slaveholder—a concession that would extend to all citizens of the United States, and would be a concession extorted as a constitutional right.

THE ANALYST

Of Cleveland, a very interesting and handsomely printed temperance paper, which has heretofore been issued semi-monthly, has been changed into a weekly. We are glad of this evidence of prosperity. The paper certainly deserves the support of the friends of the cause, and the change would indicate that it receives an encouraging share of patronage.

We would recommend those who desire such a paper, to apply to G. A. Spencer & M. H. Allard, who are its publishers and proprietors. Price \$1.50.

THE RIGHT WORD IN THE RIGHT PLACE.—A New Pocket Dictionary and Reference Book; Embracing Extensive Collections of Synonyms, Technical Terms, Abbreviations, and Foreign Phrases; Chapters on writing for the Press, Punctuation, and Proof-Reading; and other Interesting and Valuable Information.

Price 50 cents. Fowler and Wells, New York. An English gentleman who was complimenting his friend upon his style of speaking, said, "I observe that you are never at a loss for a word." "That is true," was the reply, "I never am at a loss for a word, but Lord C. is never at a loss for the word."

The above named work is well adapted to assist the writer and the speaker in selecting the right word for the right place. It contains, beside, much useful information which can hardly come amiss to any one.

NATIONALIZING OF REPUBLICANISM.

Corwin was invited to a political jubilee in Kentucky; he didn't go, but sent the following letter, in which he refers to the work he had been doing in Ohio.

"LEXINGTON, Ohio, Sept. 25, 1859. "DEAR SIR: I have been so constantly engaged since I saw you, and especially since the receipt of your letter inviting me to be with you on the occasion of your mass meeting on the 22d inst, that I believe I have not answered your note. I have been constantly on the stump, fighting the heresies of Republicanism and the humbug of Democracy. The former, I trust in Ohio, are thoroughly expurgated from the creed of that party, and the latter, I hope, are somewhat damaged. I find the public mind of Ohio opening to a more catholic view of National affairs, especially on the dangerous question of slavery. Now let Kentucky meet us at some safe half way house, so that we may sit down in peace together again. Give my best regards to Mr. Moore, and believe me, as ever, your sincere friend,